1	P. Kristofer Strojnik, SBN 242728		
2	pstrojnik@strojniklaw.com Esplanade Center III, Suite 700		
3	2415 East Camelback Road		
4	Phoenix, Arizona 85016 415-450-0100 (tel.)		
5			
6	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9	THERESA BROOKE, a married woman		
10	dealing with her sole and separate claim,	Case No:	
11	Plaintiff,	VERIFIED COMPLAINT	
12	vs.	(JURY TRIAL DEMANDED)	
13	VALLE NUEVO LLC, a California limited		
14	liability company,		
15	Defendant.		
16	Disintiff allowers		
17	Plaintiff alleges:		
18	PARTIES D. L. CONTILL D. CONT		
19	1. Plaintiff Theresa Brooke is a married woman. Plaintiff is legally disabled,		
20	and is therefore a member of a protected class under the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12102(2),		
21	the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 et seq., the		
22	California Unruh Civil Rights Act. Plaintiff ambulates with the aid of a wheelchair due		
23	to the loss of a leg.		
24	2. Defendant, Valle Nuevo LLC, owns and/or operates and does business as		
25	the hotel America's Best Value Inn & Suites Fontana located at 16780 Valley		
26	Boulevard, Fontana, California 92335. Defendant's hotel is a public accommodation		
27	pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(A), which offers public lodging services. On		
28	information and belief, Defendant's hotel was built or renovated after March 15, 2012.		

1

2 3

4 5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

14

15

13

16

17

18 19

20

21

22 23

24

25

26 27

28

**JURISDICTION** 

- 3. Jurisdiction in this Court is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.
- 4. Plaintiff's claims asserted herein arose in this judicial district and Defendant does substantial business in this judicial district.
- 5. Venue in this judicial district is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) and (c) in that this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to the claims occurred.
- Pursuant to Arroyo v. Rosas, supplemental jurisdiction is appropriate over Plaintiff's Unruh claim. On a case-specific analysis, there are no compelling reasons to decline jurisdiction.

**ALLEGATIONS** 

- 7. Plaintiff alleges that Defendant's hotel's disabled parking is not the shortest possible route to the Hotel lobby entrance. Section 208.3.1.
- 8. Disabled parking spots relate to Plaintiff's disability because she has only one leg and uses a wheelchair, and disabled parking provides for an access aisle and closer distances to an accessible entrance.
- 9. It is more difficult for a person in a wheelchair to move about than a person who is able to walk; it is also more time-consuming. Hence, disabled parking spots must be the closest to the building entrance to counter-act the difficulty and extra time, i.e. make things equal.
- 10. Plaintiff formerly worked in the hospitality industry. She and her husband are avid travelers across California for purposes of leisure travel and to "test" whether various hotels comply with disability access laws. Testing is encouraged by the Ninth Circuit.
- 11. Plaintiff visited Defendant's hotel, which has a parking lot. However, the disabled parking spots were not the shortest distance to the lobby entrance, which is required pursuant to Section 208.3 of the Standards. The Hotel's non-disabled parking

- spots are much closer to the entrance. As a result of the violation that she personally encountered (disabled parking not shortest route to entrance), she was deterred from entering the Hotel lobby and left the Hotel.
- 12. Plaintiff has certain plans of returning and staying at the Hotel in August 2024 during one of her many trips to the Los Angeles area, but if she arrives then and Defendant has not remediated, she will remain deterred and will not enter the Hotel.
- 13. It is readily achievable and inexpensive to modify the Hotel to move a disabled parking spot to the shortest possible route to the lobby entrance.
- 14. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff and others will continue to be unable to independently use Defendant's hotel in violation of her rights under the ADA.

## FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

- 15. Plaintiff incorporates all allegations heretofore set forth.
- 16. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff and others in that it has failed to make its public lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a) and § 121282(b)(2)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above.
- 17. Defendant has discriminated against Plaintiff in that it has failed to remove architectural barriers to make its lodging services fully accessible to, and independently usable by individuals who are disabled in violation of 42 U.S.C. §12182(b)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above. Compliance with the 2010 Standards would neither fundamentally alter the nature of Defendant's lodging services nor result in an undue burden to Defendant.
- 18. In violation of the 2010 Standards, Defendant's Hotel parking lot does not comply with Section 208.3 of the Standards, as described above.
- 19. Compliance with 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv) and the 2010 Standards, as described above, is readily achievable by the Defendant. *Id*. Readily achievable

relief as the Court considers appropriate, including monetary damages in an amount of

Pursuant to Cal Civ. Code §52, Plaintiff is further entitled to such other

26

27

28

26.

\$4,000.00, and not more.

1	27.	Pursuant to Unruh, Plaintiff is entitled to attorney's fees and costs in an	
2	amount to be proven at trial.		
3	WHEREFORE, Plaintiff demands judgment against Defendant as follows:		
4	a.	Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action Defendant	
5		was in violation of the specific requirements of Unruh; and	
6	b.	Permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR § 36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its	
7		parking lot into full compliance with the requirements set forth in the	
8	ADA;		
9	c.	Payment of costs and attorney's fees;	
10	d.	Damages in the amount of \$4,000.00; and	
11	e.	Provision of whatever other relief the Court deems just, equitable and	
12		appropriate.  DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
13	Plaintiff hereby demands a jury trial on issues triable by a jury.		
14	Training hereby demands a jury true on issues triable by a jury.		
15	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 22d day of February, 2024.		
16 17			
18	<u>/s/ P. Kristofer Strojnik</u> P. Kristofer Strojnik (242728)		
19	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
20	<u>Verification</u>		
21	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.		
22	DATED this 22d day of February, 2024.		
23			
24		MAR 1	
25			
26			
27		Theresa Marie Brooke	
	i		